

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 34-39 are pending in this application, and claims 1,3-6, 19, and 34-49 were rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 19 and 34-39 in view of the amendments below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by **Schofield et al** (Pat. No. 6,690,268). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The video system of **Schofield** cited in the Office Action discloses a first video monitor (86, 96, or 1606) and a second video monitor (87, 97 or 1607), which may simultaneously display different video outputs such as a back-up image on the first monitor for the driver, and an image of the passengers on the second monitor. The second video monitor (87, 97, or 1607) cited in the Office Action is not in a substantially different location from the first video monitor (86, 96, or 1606), but rather is located on the same rear view mirror or front windshield image display. Accordingly, the first and second video monitors in the **Schofield** system cited in the Office Action are not located in a different location from each other such that a passenger in the rear of the vehicle may view the image on the second video monitor. The first and second video monitors in **Schofield** are rather intended for the driver to view without excessive head movement or distraction (column 53, line 10). The video system of **Schofield** does disclose a second overhead video monitor (14030 in Fig. 38, Column 53, line 37) that provides DVD movies or images of other passengers in the vehicle. However, this second video monitor disclosed in **Schofield** is only provided for improved electronic conversation between passengers and playing DVD movies.

With regard to independent claims 1, 34 and 35, these claims as currently amended require the vehicle video system to be capable of switching a video signal of an image outside of the vehicle to the second video monitor, such that a passenger in the rear of a vehicle (e.g. – a Recreational Vehicle) would be able to view areas surrounding the outside of the vehicle as a security feature. **Schofield** does not disclose or suggest the display of images outside of the vehicle on the second video monitor, which is in a location that passengers in the rear of the vehicle may view. Applicants believe this feature provides a novel means for displaying a video output on a second video monitor of areas surrounding the outside of the vehicle to improve passenger awareness and security. Applicants submit that this feature is distinguished over **Schofield**, and provides a novel security feature that has been found to address the interests of consumers interested in both driver awareness and improved security. As such, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 5, 6, 34, and 35 are allowable.

With regard to dependent claims 5-6, and 36-39, these claims ultimately depend from independent claims 1 or 35, which applicants believe to be allowable. As such, applicants submit that dependent claims 5-6 and 36-39 are also allowable for at least these reasons.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schofield et al** (Pat. No. 6,690,268) in view of **Lee** (Pat. No. 5,680,123). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claim 19, this claim as currently amended requires the vehicle video system to be capable of switching a video signal of an image outside of the vehicle to the second video monitor, such that a passenger in the rear of a vehicle (e.g. – a Recreational Vehicle) would be able to view areas surrounding the outside of the vehicle as a security feature. **Schofield** does not teach or suggest the display of images outside of the vehicle on the second video monitor, which is in a location that passengers in the rear of the vehicle may view. Applicants submit this feature provides a novel means for displaying on the second video monitor the areas surrounding the outside of the vehicle to improve passenger awareness and security, and that this distinguishes independent claim 19 over **Schofield**. Applicants also submit that the above feature would not have been obvious from the combination of the above cited references, because the references do not teach or suggest the desirability of the combination. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *MPEP 2143.01*. Obviousness cannot be established by combining references without also providing evidence of the motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the applicants have done. *MPEP 2144*. Furthermore, it is impossible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much as will support a position of obviousness, to the exclusion of the other parts of which a reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. As such, Applicants submit that claim 19 as amended is not obvious in view of **Schofield** or **Lee**.

With regard to dependent claims 3 and 4, these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 1, which applicants believe to be allowable. As such, applicants submit that dependent claims 3 and 4 are also allowable for at least these reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the stated grounds of rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 19, and 34-39 have been properly traversed, and that all newly added are allowable in view of the above arguments. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of the amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1-10-05

By: Kevin Pumm
Kevin Pumm
Reg. No. 49,046

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500